

REMARKS

In the above referenced case, claims 371 and 372 are pending. Applicant will sequentially address the issues raised by the Examiner.

I. The Drawings Objection

The drawings were objected to for allegedly failing to show the altering means for altering “the resolved beam in a pixel-wise manner.” The limitation “pixel-wise manner” has been deleted from the claims. Thus, the drawings objection is now moot.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 371-372 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement regarding the limitation “pixel-wise manner.” This limitation has been deleted from the claims. Thus, these claim rejections are now moot.

III. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 371-372 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurematsu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,153,752 (“KUREMATSU”) in view of Konno, U.S. Patent No. 4,497,015 (“KONNO”) and Jachimowicz et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,995,718 (“JACHIMOWICZ”).

The Examiner relied on KONNO for rejecting certain limitations in element [a] and JACHIMOWICZ for rejection certain limitations in element [f] of claims 371-372 and relied on KUREMATSU for all other elements.

Amended independent claim 371 recites at least the following element:

[d] combining more than two altered separate beams of
electromagnetic energy into a single collinear beam of

electromagnetic energy without previously subcombining any plurality of the altered separate beams of electromagnetic energy and without substantially changing the altered selected predetermined orientation of the chosen component of the electromagnetic wave field vectors of the plurality of portions of each of the separate beams of electromagnetic energy; ...

As will be shown below, Applicant respectfully submits that KUREMATSU fails to disclose at least element [d] of claim 371.

KUREMATSU discloses a system where the red and green beams are combined first by a first combiner (15), and then the red and green combined beam is combined with the blue beam by a second combiner (5).

The R light P_R and R light S_R which have emerged from the first LCD 8 and the G light P_G and G light S_G which have emerged from the second LCD 6 are synthesized by the third DM 15, and travel as a light component $(P_G + P_R)$ corresponding to the light portion and a light component $(S_G + S_R)$, not shown, corresponding to the dark portion ... toward the BS 5 located at the destination of emergence thereof. ... The light components $(P_G + P_R)$ and $(S_G + S_R)$ which have emerged from the third DM 15 and the B light P_B and B light S_B reflected by the total reflection mirror 14 enter the BS ... and becomes synthesized light $(S_B + P_G + P_R)$. KUREMATSU, col., 7, lines 9-48.

Thus, KUREMATSU does not disclose or suggest combining more than two altered separate electromagnetic energy beams as recited in claim 371. Rather, KUREMATSU involves first creating a subcombination of two of the beams.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that KUREMATSU cannot disclose or suggest element [d] of claim 371.

Element [d] of claim 372 has been amended to include similar limitations as in claim 371 as discussed above. Thus, based on the foregoing, claims 371-372 should be in condition for allowance.


IV. Previous Arguments

The Examiner was not persuaded by Applicant's amendments (i.e., the added limitation of "in a pixel-wise manner") and arguments in the response filed on January 18, 2005. Applicant hereby expressly retracts those amendments and arguments in their entirety.¹

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Roxana H. Yang
Registration No. 46,788

PATENTESQUE LAW GROUP, LLP
P.O. Box 400
Los Altos, CA 94023
(650) 948-0822

¹ Such retracted amendments and arguments should, therefore, not form the basis for any claim construction or prosecution history estoppel.